



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,487	09/30/2003	Barnaby L. Court	RSW920030122US1 (110)	6010

46320 7590 08/15/2006

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
1300 CORPORATE CENTER WAY
SUITE 105G
WELLINGTON, FL 33414

EXAMINER

WATT, CHRIS A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,487

Applicant(s)

COURT ET AL.

Examiner

Chris Watt

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/30/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Polonsky et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,072,984).

As to claim 1, Polonsky discloses (FIGS. 1-4) a complex table rendering (i.e. "rendering includes visual representations of the markup elements" col. 11 lines 39-43) and navigation system (i.e. "rendering of retrieved information as well as navigational capability" col. 10 lines 26-28) comprising: a plurality of row range views (i.e. "various numbers of ... rows" col. 19 lines 10-14), a plurality of row views, each of said row views having an association with one of said row range views (i.e. "rows will become children of the parent nodes" col. 21 lines 63-67), and a plurality of record views, each of said record views having an association with one of said row views (i.e. "cell formatter ... extracts the data row by row" col. 22 lines 56-57), a complex (defined in col. 26 lines 31-33) table processor (i.e. "extract content from the table into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60) coupled to an application server (i.e. "majority of the processing information on the server side and ... visible information to

the client browser" col. 23 lines 63-65, see also col. 4 line 47) and programmed to reduce a complex table (i.e. "extract content from the table into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60, col. 26 lines 31-33) into said row range views (i.e. "various numbers of ... rows" col. 19 lines 10-14), said row views (i.e. "rows will become children of the parent nodes" col. 21 lines 63-67) and said record views (i.e. "extracts the data row by row" col. 22 lines 56-57), and, a controller (i.e. "event translator" col. 6 line 11) configured to map selected events and triggers originating within said views to others of said views (i.e. "identifies each node in the document using a unique value" col. 10 lines 3-4), and to map additional selected events and triggers originating within said views to said complex table (i.e. "client browser events sends events and receives responses to and from the server browser" col. 10 lines 16-19).

As to claim 3, Polonsky teaches (FIGS. 10-11) a method of enabling complex table navigation (i.e. "extract content from the table into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60, "navigational capability" col. 10 line 28) in a highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26), the method comprising the steps of: reducing a complex table defined in markup (i.e. "extract content from the table into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60) to a row range view (i.e. "rows will become children of the parent nodes" col. 21 lines 63-67), a set of row views (i.e. "rows will become children of the parent nodes" col. 21 lines 63-67) and a set of record views (i.e. "extracts the data row by row" col. 22 lines 56-57), navigably linking (i.e. "list of

Art Unit: 2179

links" col. 17 line 40) individual ones of said record views to selected ones of said row views (i.e. "similar fragments of the tree" col. 17 line 42), and further navigably linking individual ones of said row views to selected row ranges disposed in said row range view (i.e. "collapsed into folders" col. 17 lines 42-43), and, presenting said row range view responsive to a request to render said complex table in the highly constrained device (i.e. "the output ... is a hierarchical content tree" col. 17 lines 30-31).

As to claim 7, Polonsky teaches a method of enabling complex table navigation (i.e. "extract content from the table into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60, "navigational capability" col. 10 line 28) in a highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26), the method comprising the steps of: parsing a complex table defined by intent based markup (i.e. "extract content from the table" col. 21 lines 46-60), producing a reduced view of said complex table (i.e. "into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60, "navigational capability" col. 10 line 28), said reduced view comprising a selection of row ranges defining ranges of rows in said complex table (i.e. "various numbers of ... rows" col. 19 lines 10-14), and rendering said reduced view (i.e. "rendering includes visual representations of the markup elements" col. 11 lines 39-43) in the highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26), responsive to a selection of one of said ranges of rows (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 17 lines 8-9), further producing a further reduced view of said complex table (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 17 lines 8-9), said further reduced view comprising a selection of rows in said selected one of said ranges of rows (i.e.

Art Unit: 2179

"higher weight document" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), and rendering said further reduced view in the highly constrained device in lieu of said reduced view (i.e. "child nodes" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), and, responsive to a selection of one of said rows (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), yet further producing a yet further reduced view of said complex table (i.e. "child nodes" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), said yet further reduced view comprising a record (i.e. "folder contents" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9) associated with said selected one of said rows (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), and rendering said yet further reduced view (i.e. "rendering includes visual representations of the markup elements" col. 11 lines 39-43) in the highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26) in lieu of said further reduced view (i.e. "child nodes become the folder contents" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9).

As to claim 8, Polonsky teaches a machine readable storage (i.e. "readable memory device" col. 28 line 54) having stored thereon a computer program (i.e. "computer program product" col. 28 line 52) for enabling complex table navigation (i.e. "extract content from the table into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60, "navigational capability" col. 10 line 28) in a highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26), the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions (i.e. "computer readable program code" col. 28 line 56) for causing the machine to perform the steps of: reducing a complex table defined in markup (i.e. "extract content from the table" col. 21 lines 46-60) to a row range view (i.e. "rows will become children of the parent nodes" col. 21

Art Unit: 2179

lines 63-67), a set of row views (i.e. "rows will become children of the parent nodes" col. 21 lines 63-67) and a set of record views (i.e. "extracts the data row by row" col. 22 lines 56-57), navigably linking (i.e. "list of links" col. 17 line 40) individual ones of said record views to selected ones of said row views (i.e. "similar fragments of the tree" col. 17 line 42), and further navigably linking individual ones of said row views to selected row ranges disposed in said row range view (i.e. "collapsed into folders" col. 17 lines 42-43); and, presenting said row range view responsive to a request to render said complex table in the highly constrained device (i.e. "the output ... is a hierarchical content tree" col. 17 lines 30-31).

As to claim 12, Polonsky teaches a machine readable storage (i.e. "readable memory device" col. 28 line 54) having stored thereon a computer program (i.e. "computer program product" col. 28 line 52) for enabling complex table navigation (i.e. "extract content from the table into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60, "navigational capability" col. 10 line 28) in a highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26), the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions (i.e. "computer readable program code" col. 28 line 56) for causing the machine to perform the steps of: parsing a complex table defined by intent based markup (i.e. "extract content from the table" col. 21 lines 46-60), producing a reduced view of said complex table (i.e. "into a linear form so that it is presentable on the device" col. 21 lines 46-60, "navigational capability" col. 10 line 28), said reduced view comprising a selection of row ranges defining ranges of rows in said complex table (i.e. "various numbers of ... rows" col. 19 lines 10-14), and

Art Unit: 2179

rendering said reduced view (i.e. "rendering includes visual representations of the markup elements" col. 11 lines 39-43) in the highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26), responsive to a selection of one of said ranges of rows (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 17 lines 8-9), further producing a further reduced view of said complex table (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 17 lines 8-9), said further reduced view comprising a selection of rows in said selected one of said ranges of rows (i.e. "higher weight document" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), and rendering said further reduced view in the highly constrained device in lieu of said reduced view (i.e. "child nodes" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), and, responsive to a selection of one of said rows (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), yet further producing a yet further reduced view of said complex table (i.e. "child nodes" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), said yet further reduced view comprising a record (i.e. "folder contents" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9) associated with said selected one of said rows (i.e. "walk down the branch" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9), and rendering said yet further reduced view (i.e. "rendering includes visual representations of the markup elements" col. 11 lines 39-43) in the highly constrained device (i.e. "electronic devices with limited hardware ... capability" col. 2 line 26) in lieu of said further reduced view (i.e. "child nodes become the folder contents" col. 16 line 64 - col. 17 line 9).

As to claim 2, Polonsky teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising a filter management view (i.e. "customization of original information content if a modified outcome is desired at the electronic device" col. 3 lines 9-11).

As to claim 4, Polonsky teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising the step of selecting and deselecting individual records in said record views (i.e. "selectable input elements" col. 17 line 38).

As to claim 5, Polonsky teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising the steps of: establishing a set of filter criteria (i.e. "filtering information content" col. 3 lines 15-16) for selecting individual records linked to said row views (i.e. "promotion of content into and out of folders" col. 3 lines 14-15), filtering a display of said row views based upon said filter criteria (i.e. "dropping or filtering information content" col. 3 lines 15-16), and, rendering said filtered display in the highly constrained device (i.e. "content from the serialized output to an electronic device" col. 3 line 16).

As to claim 6, Polonsky teaches the method of claim 3, further comprising the steps of: receiving a plurality of events generated in said views (i.e. "event translator" col. 3 line 51), and, handling selected ones of said events (i.e. "scrolling, clicking") without knowledge of an application producing said complex table where said selected ones of said events map to said views and not to said complex table (i.e. "convert user events within one markup domain ... while staying in the transaction" col. 3 lines 52-54).

As to claim 9, Polonsky teaches the machine-readable storage of claim 8, further comprising the step of selecting and deselecting individual records in said record views (i.e. "selectable input elements" col. 17 line 38).

As to claim 10, Polonsky teaches the machine readable storage of claim 8, further comprising the steps of: establishing a set of filter criteria (i.e. "filtering information content" col. 3 lines 15-16) for selecting individual records linked to said row

Art Unit: 2179

views (i.e. "promotion of content into and out of folders" col. 3 lines 14-15), filtering a display of said row views based upon said filter criteria (i.e. "dropping or filtering information content" col. 3 lines 15-16), and, rendering said filtered display in the highly constrained device (i.e. "content from the serialized output to an electronic device" col. 3 line 16).

As to claim 11, Polonsky teaches the machine readable storage of claim 8, further comprising the steps of: receiving a plurality of events generated in said views (i.e. "event translator" col. 3 line 51), and, handling selected ones of said events (i.e. "scrolling, clicking") without knowledge of an application producing said complex table where said selected ones of said events map to said views and not to said complex table (i.e. "convert user events within one markup domain ... while staying in the transaction" col. 3 lines 52-54).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Leduc (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,351) teaches a table layout for a small "footprint" device, such as a cell phone or PDA. Bickmore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102) teaches re-authoring of HTML content for a PDA or cell phone.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris Watt whose telephone number is (703) 270-1046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-4:00 Eastern.

Art Unit: 2179

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (703) 270-0000. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris A. Watt/

August 2, 2006

CAW


CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER